

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13 - 19, 21, 22, 24 - 33, 35, 36 and 38 - 49 are pending for consideration in the present application, wherein claims 44 - 49 are newly added. Claims 4, 7, 9, 12, 20, 23, 34 and 37 are canceled, wherein claim 9 was previously canceled, and claims 4, 7, 12, 20, 23, 34 and 37 are being canceled by the present amendment. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

In section 3 of the Office Action, 1 - 6, 8, 10, 12 - 15, 17 - 22, 24, 25, 27 - 29, 31 - 36, 38, 39, 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by International Publication No. WO 99/08206 to Sinander (hereinafter "the Sinander publication"). Of this set of rejected claims, three are independent, namely claims 1, 17 and 31. Applicants are clarifying as aspect of claims 1, 17 and 31 that is not disclosed by the Sinander application.

Claim 1 provides for a method for supporting versioning of data in a content management system.

The method includes:

maintaining a first table for storing an identifier of a most recent version of a data item; and
maintaining a second table for storing an identifier of an older version of said data item,
wherein, when said data item is to be updated,

- (i) said second table is updated to include said identifier of said most recent version of said data from said first table, so that said second table stores both of said identifier of said older version of said data item and said identifier of said most recent version of said data item, and
- (ii) said first table is updated to store an identifier of a new version of said data item.

In the present application, FIG. 2 depicts an exemplary organization of database 200 data for supporting the versioning of data items in accordance with the method of claim 1. Database 200 data is stored in two tables, namely, a first table 205, (Table 1), and a second table 210, (Table 2). First table 205 is established and maintained for storing the most recent version of a database data item therein.

Second table 210 is established and maintained for storing all other versions of the data item other than the most recent version of the data item therein.

FIG. 2 shows that a Data Item 1 has a most recent version (4) and several older versions (0) - (3). Assume that Data Item 1 is about to be updated from version (4) to version (5). Accordingly:

- (i) table 210 would be updated to include the identifier of the most recent version, i.e., version (4),
and
- (ii) table 205 would be updated to identify the new version, e.g., version (5).

The Sinander publication is directed toward a technique for upgrading a database (page. 1, lines 7 - 8). With reference to FIG. 2b, the Sinander publication describes a new table created to receive data that is stored in an old table (page 5, lines 9 - 12). The old table and the new table contain data to be updated, and during the upgrade, both of the old table and new table are updated (to hold updated data) (page 6, lines 7 - 15). A systemtable (e.g., Table 1 shown on page 7) holds references to stored procedures (e.g., base version, target version, and upgrade version) (page 7, lines 1 - 22). The base version of a procedure is used during normal operation (page 7, lines 23 - 25). The target version of a procedure is used during an upgrade operation (page 8, lines 1 - 6). The upgrade version facilitates the updating of the old table and the new table (page 8, lines 6 - 13).

The Decision, in a paragraph that spans pages 6 - 7, in an analysis of the Sinander publication,

The Decision indicates that the Sinander publication, on pages 7 - 8, in its description of Table 1, discloses an updating of tables. In this regard, the Decision, in a paragraph that spans pages 6 - 7, states:

The skilled artisan would have also understood that, if a database is upgraded, the systemtable will reflect that upgrade by changing a stored procedure's "base version" entry to its "target version" entry (e.g., from "sp_a_1.0" to "sp_a_1.1"); and by changing the stored procedure's "target version" entry to show the next version to be added (e.g., from "sp_a_1.1" to "sp_a_1.2"). Thus, a skilled artisan would have understood Sinander's "target version" column as being "a first table ... updated to identify a new version of said data item" (i.e., to identify the next stored procedure version to be added); and Sinander's "base version" column as being a "second table ... updated to include said identifier

of said most recent version of said data from said first table" (i.e., updated from the "target version" column to identify the most recently accepted stored procedure version).

However, although the Sinander publication Table 1 includes a "base version" of a stored procedure and a "target version" of a stored procedure, it does not represent a version of the stored procedure that is older than the base version. Moreover, since the technique in Sinander publication is for upgrading a database, the Sinander publication is not concerned with versions of procedures that are not employed during the upgrading of the database, and so, it is not concerned with versions that are older than the base version. For example, referring to the Decision's analysis of the Sinander publication (quoted above), after the update, the target version entry will be "sp_a_1.2", and the base version entry will be "sp_a_1.1", but the systemtable will not include any reference to "sp_a_1.0". As such, the Sinander publication neither discloses nor suggests that when said data item is to be updated,

- (i) said **second table** is updated to include said identifier of said most recent version of said data from said first table, so that said second table **stores both of** said identifier of said **older version** of said data item **and** said identifier of said **most recent version** of said data item, and
- (ii) said **first table** is updated to store an identifier of a **new version** of said data item.

Therefore, the Sinander publication does not anticipate claim 1.

Independent claims 17 and 31 each include recitals similar to those of claim 1, as described above. As such, claims 17 and 31, for reasoning similar to that provided in support of claim 1, are also novel over the Sinander application.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10 and 13 – 15 depend from claim 1. Claims 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25 and 27 – 29 depend from claim 17. Claims 32, 33, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41 and 42 depend from claim 31. By virtue of these dependencies, claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 13 – 15, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27 – 29, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41 and 42 are also novel over the Sinander application.

Claims 4, 12, 20, 23, 34 and 37 are canceled. As such, the rejection thereof is rendered moot.

Applicants are requesting reconsideration and a withdrawal of the section 102(b) rejection of claims 1 – 6, 8, 10, 12 – 15, 17 – 22, 24, 25, 27 – 29, 31 – 36, 38, 39, 41 and 42.

In section 4 of the Office Action, claims 7, 23 and 37 are rejected. However, claims 7, 23 and 37 are canceled, and as such, the rejection thereof is rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants are requesting a withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7, 23 and 37.

In section 5 of the Office Action, claims 11, 26 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Sinander publication in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20020103815 to Duvillier et al. (hereinafter "the Duvillier et al. application").

Claims 11, 26 and 40 depend from claims 1, 17 and 31, respectively. Applicants submit that the Duvillier et al. application does not make up for the deficiency of the Sinander application, as the Sinander application relates to claims 1, 17 and 31. Accordingly, Applicants further submit that claims 1, 17 and 31, and claims 11, 26 and 40, by virtue of their dependencies, are all patentable over the cited combination of the Sinander application and the Duvillier et al. application.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 103(a) rejection of claims 11, 26 and 40.

In section 6 of the Office Action, claims 16, 30 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Sinander publication in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20020073089 to Schwartz et al. (hereinafter "the Schwartz et al. publication").

Claims 16, 30 and 43 depend from claims 1, 17 and 31, respectively. Applicants submit that the Schwartz et al. publication does not make up for the deficiency of the Sinander publication, as the Sinander publication relates to claims 1, 17 and 31. Accordingly, Applicants further submit that claims 1, 17 and 31, and claims 16, 30 and 43, by virtue of their dependencies, are all patentable over the cited combination of the Sinander publication and the Schwartz et al. publication.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 103(a) rejection of claims 16, 30 and 43.

As mentioned above, Applicants are clarifying an aspect of independent claims 1, 17 and 31 that is not described by the Sinander application. Applicants are adding claims 44 - 49 to even further provide the claim coverage that Applicants appear to deserve based on the prior art that was cited by the Examiner. The features of claims 44, 46 and 48 are shown in FIG. 2, and the features of claims 45, 47 and 49 are described at page 8, line 16 - page 9, line 15. A favorable consideration that also results in the allowance of claims 44 - 49 is earnestly solicited.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims presented in this application patentably distinguish over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration and that this application be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

5/7/18

Paul D. Greeley

Reg. No. 31,019

Attorney for the Applicants

Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.

One Landmark Square, 10th Floor

Stamford, CT 06901-2682

Tel: 203-327-4500

Fax: 203-327-6401